DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 358 018 SO 023 122

AUTHOR Wiles, David
TITLE Diversity Curriculum in Public Schools without Minority Pupils.
PUB DATE 92
NOTE 48p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Cultural Pluralism; *Educational Policy; *Educational Research; Elementary Secondary Education; History Instruction; Minority Groups; *Multicultural Education; *Poverty; *Public Schools; Social Studies; *Superintendents
IDENTIFIERS *New York

ABSTRACT

In 1990 the New York State Board of Regents approved a recommendation that the teaching of history be inclusive and reflect U.S. pluralism by including the contributions of all minorities to the development of the country. While New York is often viewed as an urban state and does have large minority populations in its urban areas, there are 141 K-12 districts (housing over 150,000 students) that report a less than 1% minority pupil enrollment and 98.6% of these districts are located in nonmetropolitan settings. The basic purposes of this study were to ascertain what the curriculum of inclusion meant for the administrative leaders of New York school districts with few minority pupils. Sixty-two school superintendents from these districts were surveyed concerning their perceptions of the implementation of the curriculum of inclusion within their districts. The primary policy implication of the study of administrator perceptions concerned the meaning of the word disadvantaged. The curriculum of inclusion as outlined in 1990 presented the issue of diversity as a racial and urban concern. The administrators surveyed in this study felt strongly that being disadvantaged for reasons of poverty should be part of the diversity discussion of all children. (Contains 21 references.) (DB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED358018

Diversity Curriculum in Public Schools Without Minority Pupils

David Wiles

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
DAVID WILES
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

SO023122

Diversity Curriculum in Public Schools Without Minority Pupils

The searing description of inner city education, presented by Jonathan Kozol in Savage Inequalities (1991), argues for the discussion of "at risk" schools to emphasize race and ethnicity within American society. The racial discrimination, isolation and underfunding Kozol described public schooling in the mid 1960's (Death at an Early Age, 1967) has only intensified in its savagery for urban children during the subsequent three decades. The official report of the "condition of education" by the New York State Education Department provides a more abstract and less passionate confirmation of the same assertion: that public education operates as;

> "two systems, one rich, white and performing well; the other poor, of color and failing academically."
> (Commissioner's Preface, New York State of Learning, 1991)

Thus, inner city and poverty are descriptions of poor performing school children, while underfunding and race become the perceived realities of what creates the "at risk" aspect of the schooling environment.

The same undercurrents of race, poverty and inner city explain the rationale behind a mandated curriculum for the topic of "diversity." In 1987, the New York Commissioner of Education created a task force to study the teaching of history in social studies. Three years later, the Board of Regents approved an recommendation that the teaching of history be "inclusive" and reflect American pluralism by including the contributions of all minorities to the development of the country. · Implementation of the mandate in New York schools since 1991 has created a subsequent discussion of what is known as the curriculum of inclusion. Spin off terminology includes multicultural, mosiac, foreign, Eurocentric or Afrocentric, pluralism and

democracy. General discussion of either diversity or inclusion is often emotional and confrontational, as language distinctions substitute for policies that succeed or fail in particular contexts.

Three economic driven issues left unsolved at the time of approval were (1) whether money disadvantage was strictly an urban phenomenon, (2) the relationship of poverty to children labelled minority and (3)the relationship of being poor to being educationally disadvantaged. While not downplaying the Kozol type argument for city environments, there has been growing recognition that economic driven issues are prevalent in the most remote rural parts of the state, where the inequality of being poor is every bit as savage, but where virtually all the children in school are not labelled minority. This fact makes the real economic definition of "disadvantaged" in New York a bimodal distribution, with suburbs deemed affluent and not in the equation; the poverty of cities highly visable on one end and the often ignored, invisable rural inequalities on the other . This suggests the curriculum base of the diversity issues may provide a surface sheen to the deeper currents of redistributive economic politics or "clout" that pit the cities versus the rural countryside, especially in "urban" states like New York(Cibulka, 1992). If poverty is the real underpinning for the rationale of disadvantaged and schooling ,a poor child is not any better or worse off because of the proportionate numbers of others suffering the same fate in a big city or a small township. Each child has the same "inclusive" right to quality public schooling, regardless of geographic and demographic context.

Another type of fiscal condition that has affected the implementation of curriculum of inclusion, was the dramatic economic recession statewide(Ehrenhalt, 1992). The Board of Regents approved the inclusion mandate as part

of a major educational reform agenda called the Compact for Learning. In the two years since approval, there have been few monies to undertake the fundamental transformation of existing curriculums. Given the general problem of guaranteeing a connection between policy intent and actual implementation in any complex organization(Geller and Johnston, 1990, Commission on Rural Resources, 1992), it is possible that diversity aspects of social studies entered the teaching of history in a staggered fashion. The dissipative tendencies of implementation itself transforms the communicated meaning to endpoint interpretation. The more decentralized the implementation of a policy mandate, the more the accountability for actual operation is a grassroots phenomenon(Elmore, 1983a). In New York State public education there are more than seven hundred school districts. It is of no surprise that a large percent of minority pupil populations are related to the handful of districts in big city and urban settings, but the actual extent of concentration is not always appreciated. New York State educated over 2.5 million public school children in 1990-91 and nearly one forth were Black or Hispanic(24.4%). Yet, the five big cities of New York(City, Buffalo, Rochester, Syracuse, Yonkers)schooled four of five of all Black students and nine of ten of all Hispanic students.

The rest of these particular minorities, spread out in the 700 other k-12 districts throughout the state, numbered less than 150,000 or under one percent of the 1.4 million non big city students. Given such dispersion, it seems fair to speculate that some non urban k-12 districts may be viewing the "curriculum of inclusion" mandate as perhaps, a "frill" in relation to other mandated responsibilities in academic year 1992-93. While inclusion of diversity emphasis in the teaching of social studies may not cost much in

dollars, its much touted "urban" relacionship to race and ethnicity could make it be perceived as less vital in those districts without significant minority student populations. In New York, there are 141 k-12 districts (housing over 150,000 students) that report less than one percent "minority" pupils enrolled and 98.6% of these districts with virtually are located in "nonmetropolitan" settings.

Statement of the Problem

The basic purposes of this study were to ascertain what the curriculum of inclusion meant for the administrative leaders of select New York districts at the start of the 1992-93 school year. First, how special were the demographic characteristics of k-12 jurisdictions that enrolled only nonminority students? Second, did administrators in all white pupil settings exhibit commitment to the responsibility of implementing the statewide "inclusion" mandate and, if so, were race and ethnicity perceived as the intellectual cornerstones in the modified history curriculum ? Third , did the general opinions about inclusion vary where the combined wealth ratios for nonminority districts were worse than half the state average ? Fourth, did general opinions vary by geographic location of nonminority districts in different parts of "upstate" New York? Finally, what specific groupings of people other than Afro American and Hispanic were be identified as "distinctive" enough to be a minority for curriculum with a diversity focus?

A delimitation of the study is asking the chief school officer of a district about the status of any curriculum being implemented by teachers in classrooms. All perceptual analyses appear frail compared to physical documentation of actual performances, and this frailty seems exacerbated by the difference in organizational roles. On the other hand, the chief

administrator is responsible to the Board of Education for implementing the academic program(Elmore, 1983b) and, especially in smaller districts, can sense the general tenor of what a potentially controversial curriculum might be providing(Meyers, et.al.,1987). In this particular study, 90 percent of responding superintendents were administering districts with less than 2000 children in grades k-12 and the average size of all districts represented by the study was 1111 in grades k-12.

Methodology

To appreciate the specialness of nonminority districts in New York State, the k-12 jurisdictions that enrolled 99 percent of more white pupils were compared to the statewide average (from State Education Department statistics and a model containing 647 jurisdictions without New York city and districts with less than a full k-12 grade complement) and to New York City as a separate jurisdiction. All demographic information used to compare the "nonminority" set of k-12 district jurisdictions were collected from official sources of the State Education Department(1990,1991, 1991-92) and Office of the State Comptroller(released December 1991).

The poverty measure used to classify an individual district was made of the combined wealth ratio and the dollars spent for each child in average daily membership. The Combined Wealth Ratio(hereafter CWR) , a combination of property and personal income values used in educational state aid formula calculations, was identified as a measure of general wealth capability . Dollars spent per child in average daily membership (hereafter $CAADM) was identified as a measure of fiscal effort made to support the educational enterprise. Because the "urban" emphasis of the curriculum of inclusion generated this particular study, the economic condition of New York City was

used as benchmark for comparing the relative poverty of nonminority k-12 districts of New York. New York City has a CWR of 0.9, less than the statewide average of 1.0 and, in 1991, spent $6609 per child in average daily attendance which is also less than the state average of $6908. However,126 of 141 or 89% of the nonminority districts in this study had less than the New York City CWR of 0.9 and spent less than $6609 per child.

With two exceptions, the New York districts with no minority pupils are located "upstate", north of the Catskill Recreation Park. Using zip codes as a common locator reference for individual districts, four geographic areas of "upstate" were identified. The West area contained thirty eight districts, South/Central contained forty one districts, the North area contained twenty eight districts and the East area contained twenty eight districts.

A sample of 62 of the 141 superintendents were selected for collection by stratifying both economic indication and the geographic location by the four areas of upstate. The decision rules for an acceptable survey response was a return rate of better than 60%, at least seven districts above the indices of CWR and $CAADM, and a minimum of six responses from each of the four upstate areas with at least two responses from each individual zip code clustering. The 41 usable returns represent a 66% overall return rate and satisfied the other decision criteria(see Appendix A).

The survey was constructed by reviewing the newspaper coverage of the 1990 "inclusion" controversy, histories of the war on poverty, desegregation, the philosophy of diversity and translating basic points into questionnaire items. The questionnaire was pilot tested for clarity and face validity by three superintendents in full time graduate study at The University at Albany in Spring 1992. Part one consisted of general statements to agree or

disagree with. Words utilized in specific item construction included distinctiveness, diverse, economically disadvantaged, educationally disadvantaged, inner city, children of color, ethnicity, race, urban, multicultural, Eurocentric, Afrocentric, equity, political correctness and pluralism. Questions about the foreign aspects of Canada, India and learning a language other than English were also included. Part two asked for two independent assessments of sixteen groups that could possibly be called "distinctive." The superintendents were first asked whether they personally felt a group had a legitimate claim to being identified as distinctive. They were then asked to reassess all the groups as to whether some were actually being expressed in the ongoing curriculum of inclusion for academic year 1992-1993. The groupings contained ethnic reference(Native Americans Asians, people from Caribbean, Central Americans),social status(young children, elderly, military, homeless), economic(unemployed, retired, migrants,veterans) and special populations(HIV Positive, women, disabled) that could conceivably be perceived as "distinct" enough for the curriculum of inclusion.

For a conservative posture in interpreting differences in perception, the ten point response scale was collapsed to a three place categorization; responses 1 through 3 were "agree", 4 through 7 as "unsure" and 8 through 10 were "disagree." Chi square analyses utilized the three response classification of raw data to compare districts by poverty and location differences.

The All White Pupil Districts in New York State

Appendix **B** documents that the Combined Wealth Ratio(CWR) is particularly suited to establishing the poverty claim as it correlates with dollars spent per average membership child($CAADM) at .89 (correlation squared, .79 as gross measure of systematic variation accounted for) of the nonminority districts of New York. The less capability to support a schooling program with personal and property income, the less spent on children in average daily membership. Other descriptions used to further identify the "nonminority districts" of New York were percent of children receiving free or reduced fee lunches, the enrollment, process variable of percent of expenditures spent on instructions , the outcome variable of advanced graduation diploma(ie.Regent) percentage and the remoteness of the jurisdiction as the enrolled pupils are divided by square miles.

While the average percent of children on free or reduced lunches is somewhat higher for the nonminority districts than the total state, the nonminority district with the highest percent is less than 51 compared to several other districts in the state with more than sixty percent participation. The enrollment of nonminority districts averages close to 1100 pupils in grades k-12 compared to the statewide model average of close to 2,500. We must remember the "upstate" nature of the nonminority districts and the relative relationship of such district jurisdictions to New York City with more than 930,000 students and the other Big Four city districts that average 38,000 pupils. The production function aspect of percent of expenditures spent on instructional activities finds the nonminority districts considerably below the official statewide average (but same as statistical state model) and New York City average. The output variable of Regent Diploma graduates finds the

nonminority districts with the same percent as the official state average, ahead of New York City and below the statistical state model.

Finally, we see that none of the nonminority group of districts has a density of more than 650 pupils per square mile and, in fact, the majority are less than 25 children per square mile(actual average is 24.77). The statewide model average is 152.71 and the New York City district, in which 931,000 children attend in 307 square miles, has a density of 3032.

We can conclude that the nonminority districts in New York State demand a special population analysis; a study to provide a set of findings about this particular district jurisdictions that cannot be generalized to statewide policy or New York City policy. Beyond the obvious specialness of a virtual lack of minority students compared to a state average of 13 percent and the New York City average of 31 percent, the systematic study of the nonminority district respondents demands specific information be given on all descriptive variables, analytical categories and responses to those key questions concerning race and ethnicity that underlie the methodological construction. Appendix **C** profiles the core demographic characteristics of the 41 respondent jurisdictions(coded by county of location).

General Feelings About Implementing the Curriculum of Inclusion

As a group, the superintendents of nonminority districts were virtually unanimous (Yes 39, Unsure 0, No 1) on only one item on the survey; " **economic disadvantaged pupil** is a concept as appropriate for the discussion of remote rural schooling settings as it is for the dense inner city." There was, however, strong agreement (Yes 28, Unsure 10 ,No 3) about "districts or buildings where the pupils are virtually all white find a greater difficulty in learning and appreciating **diversity** than in jurisdictions where the student

body is 25 percent or less white", that (Yes 32,Unsure 5 ,No 3) "issues of **multicultural** have been translated as urban concerns, primarily about Black and Hispanic groupings" and that (Yes 30,Unsure 8, No 1) the " British Isles, Scandinavia, France, Germany and much of Eastern Europe would all qualify as the roots of 'Eurocentric' thinking." The responding superintendents also registered agreement in not affirming that (Yes 4,Unsure 6, No 20)"sensitivity to **democratic values** in 1990's America means our primary consideration must be to race and ethnicity issues."

There was a definite mix of opinion among the upstate superintendents (Yes 20,Unsure 5 ,No 15) whether "the most common use of the term **educationally disadvantaged pupils** means poorly performing inner city children of color", whether (Yes 21, Unsure 0,No 19) "all children that graduate from my district should be able to understand a **foreign** language" and whether (Yes 14, Unsure 10 ,No 16) "mandating a curriculum of **inclusion** was vital to guarantee that New York children understand the distinct and diverse nature of our society."

In general, concepts about the realities of rural poverty and classification of inner city school environment by race of pupils were confirmed in the perceptions of the upstate superintendents. The perceived difference between economic and educational disadvantage was pronounced, as was the impression that multicultural and diversity meant nonwhite pupils, and that the idea of democracy should not be reduced to a simple question of race and ethnicity. The distinction between the time of the 1991 Regent mandate to require the teaching of the inclusion curriculum and the time frame of this administrator's study(Fall 1992) may be reflected in the surprising split in feelings about foreign language for graduation and the curriculum of

inclusion. The negative or no answers may reflect the strains from implementing increased curriculum and graduation requirements in an era of shrinking fiscal resources. Since 1991, superintendents throughout New York have petitioned the Board of Regents for variances to a variety of curriculum requirements on grounds of lacking resources to achieve full implementation.

The forty one upstate superintendents were first asked to indicate the group or groups they felt had the "most legitimate claim to being a distinctive minority" and, second, whether that grouping was actually included in the social studies curriculum for Academic Year 1992-1993. The superintendents were in strong agreement that **Disabled** (Yes 29,Unsure 4,No 7), **New York Native Americans** (Yes 29, Unsure 4 ,No 7) Native Americans throughout the nation(Yes 28,Unsure 5,No 7) and **Asians** (Yes 27,Unsure 5 ,No 8) were "distinctive enough" minorities for addition to an inclusion curriculum. Superintendents felt strongly that Asians (Yes 24,Unsure 11,No 5) and New York Native Americans(Yes 27,Unsure 8,No 5) were being expressly covered in the on going 1992-1993 curriculum for their districts

They also had strong opinions that **military personnel**(Yes 4,Unsure 7, No 29) and **children under the school age** (Yes 6,Unsure 6,No 28) should <u>not</u> be a distinctive minority. Superintendents also felt both these groups and the **unemployed** (Yes 4,Unsure14, No 22) were not in the 1992-1993 inclusion curriculum.

Groupings that generated the most mixed opinions about the claim of "distinctive minority' included **elderly** (Yes 16,Unsure 7,No 17),**homeless** (Yes 18,Unsure 6,No 14) and **people with HIV Positive** virus (Yes 17,Unsure 6,

No 17). Groups that the superintendents were most unsure about inclusion in the present social studies curriculum were **people from Caribbean** (Yes 14, Unsure 12 ,No 14) and **migrant workers** (Yes 12,Unsure 14, No 14).

It would seem that the ethnicity of Asians and Native Americans plays the strongest claim for legitimacy as a "distinctive" minorities when Afro American and Hispanic labels are controlled. It is interesting that the classification of people living in the Caribbean area did not seem to carry an automatic race or ethnicity reference. Similarly, it is interesting that Disabled were strongly identified as being a distinctive minority, but feelings were mixed about sick people infected with HIV Positive virus. In terms of socio-economic classifications, the response to pre school children was more negative than to elderly and more negative to unemployed than to migrant workers. It is interesting that the upstate superintendents felt more positive about including homeless than military personnel under the "distinctive minority" label.

Do Responses Differ By Economics?

To deal with the question of whether the general economic condition of districts systematically affected the perceptual responses of superintendents, a benchmark of 0.5 CWR (1/2 the state average and slightly below the nonminority group average of .66) was used to divide the nonminority jurisdictions into two groups; 24 "over" and 17 "under." Chi square analysis of all general items, distinctive minority items and inclusion in the 1992-93 curriculum items found only one question where the 0.5 CWR systematically discriminated at better than the 95 percent level of statistical confidence. Given the special population grouping of all nonminority districts and total range of all combined wealth ratios of this group as .27 through 1.81 , the

lack of sharp differences in chi square analysis was not unexpected. Yet, on the question of whether the **unemployed** group should be considered a distinctive minority the "over" group (Yes 3, Unsure 5, No 16) differed significantly (chi square 9.39, probability .009) with the perceptions of superintendents from the "under" group(Yes 9, Unsure 4, No 4). We can conclude that unemployed persons are a direct reflection of general economics and that superintendents from districts with less than .5 CWR were more inclined to include this classification than superintendents from districts above .5 CWR.

Do Responses Differ by Location in Upstate?

Remoteness and regionalism are two topics of considerable interest in New York State policy. Remoteness usually refers to small k-12 districts located in out of the way rural areas and the strong pressure by the Governor and Board of Regents to consolidate and eliminate these jurisdictions(Haller and Monk, 1988). Regionalism usually refers to attempts to provide shared services on an "area" basis, either by an intermediate education government (eg boards of Cooperative Educational Services) or county municipality.

To provide a benchmark for discussing "upstate" as a geographic reference to "remote" location, the standard of 15 pupils per square mile (hereafter CAADM/ SQ MI) created an "over" group of 28 and an "under" group of 13 respondents. This standard is considerably less than the nonminority group average of 40. 5 (see Appendix B) and the classification of 25 CAADM/SQ MI used by the New York State Legislative Commission on Rural Resources (1991) to discuss remote rural jurisdictions. Chi square analyses of superintendent responses using the .05 level of statistical significance identified four items where remoteness creates systematic variation. In

response to the item, " sensitivity to **democratic values** in 1990's America means our primary consideration must be to race and ethnicity, " the "over 15" group (Yes 4, Unsure 5, No 4) and the "under 15" group (Yes 1,Unsure 11, No 16) were found statistically significant (chi square, 6.55, probability .03). The general remoteness classification also distinguished three groupings of claims to be a distinctive minority; women, migrant workers and people sick with HIV Positive virus. The "over 15" group (Yes 4, Unsure 4,No 5) differed from the "under 15"(Yes 7, Unsure 1, No 20) group of respondents on whether **women** should be a distinctive minority for the curriculum of inclusion(chi square 7.07, probability .02). Remoteness classification also differentiated feelings about **migrant workers**(chi square 7.06, probability .02) between the "over 15"(Yes 7 Unsure 5, No 1) and "under 15" (Yes 13, Unsure 3, Disagree 12) groups. The inclusion of **people sick with HIV Positive virus** as a distinctive minority created a statistically significant response rate(chi square 11.50, probability .003) between "over 15" (Yes 4, Unsure 6, No 3) and "under 15 " groups (Yes 13, Unsure 1, No 14)of superintendents.

Administrators representing k-12 jurisdictions with less than 15 CAADM/Square Mile seemed more negative toward the ideas of race and ethnicity being a primary concern in democratic values, or the inclusion of women and migrant workers as distinctive minority groups, than their counterparts in districts above 15 CAADM/Square Mile. Difference of opinions about victims of HIV Positive seemed due to the larger numbers of "unsure" responses in the over 15 group. We can conclude that remoteness as a generalized phenomenon does have some impact on feelings affecting the meanings of curriculum of inclusion.

The second question about location utilized zip codes to identify geographic proximity as the "upstate" New York was divided into four areas. The West area included districts from six zip locators(140,141,142, 144, 147, 148), the South Central from six zip locators(130, 131, 133, 134, 137, 138), the East from three zip locators(120. 121, 128) and the North from two zip locators(129,136). While native New Yorkers are likely to debate whether particular area differences outweigh general area classifications for certain zip code locations(eg. the 128 zip as East instead of North or the 137/138 as distinctly different and separate West "cultures" from the 144/147/148), the four area format used insured the entire upstate was represented by a minimum number of superintendent responses.

The geographic area of the upstate differentiated a statistically significant response (chi square 14.23, probability .02) to "districts where pupils are virtually **all white** find a greater difficulty learning and appreciating diversity than jurisdictions where the student body is 25 or less white." A larger number of unsure responses in the West (Yes 6, Unsure 7, No 0) seemed to distinguish it from the South/Central(Yes 8, Unsure 2, Nol), East (Yes 9, Unsure 0, No 0) and North (Yes 5, Unsure 0, No 1) areas. The geographic location also differentiated the subgroups of superintendents by perceptions of what minorities were included in the 1992-92 curriculum. **Homeless**(chi square 14.24, probability .02) seemed more likely to be in the inclusion curriculum in the West (Yes 3, Unsure 7, No 3) and East (Yes 3, Unsure 0, No 6) than the South/Central (Yes 0 Unsure 4, No 7) or North (Yes 0, Unsure 1, No 6) area. **Children under school age**(chi square 15.64, probability .01) seemed more likely to be found in the West (Yes 3, Unsure 6, No 4) than the South/Central (Yes 0, Unsure 5, No 6), East (Yes 0, Unsure 0, No 9) or

the North (Yes 0, Unsure 1, No 5) parts of upstate New York. While the systemic variation on certain items indicates the West is different from the rest of upstate New York, caution should be used for policy interpretations. The major distinction in response patterns seems to be the extent that superintendents in the West were (proportionately) unsure of certain classifications.

Conclusions and Policy Implications

The primary implication of this study of administrator perceptions is the qualitative distinction between the meaning of disadvantaged when referenced to race and disadvantaged considered as a focus to questions of poverty. The "curriculum of inclusion" controversy of Spring 1990 presented the issue of "diversity" in as a racial and urban concern. The reason Black and Hispanic minorities were identified as the direct reflection of "diversity" controversy was more a function of political mobilization of claims to being disadvantaged than philosophical rationalization of the social studies curriculum. These same interest groups were instrumental in the political evolution of urban, big city politics for the past thirty years(Spring 1992). While it seems fair to conclude that the genesis of much of the inclusion controversy of Spring 1990 was also embedded in the policy ferment for desegregation of races in schools and the civil rights implications of Great Society policies (Edsall, 1992), being disadvantaged for poverty reasons in the 1990's is part of the "diversity" discussion of all children (Center for the Future of Children, 1992). The disadvantage of being poor is not delimited to living in an urban area or being nonwhite.

The recognition of multiple meanings of disadvantaged seems the perceptual cornerstone for making sense of words like "multicultural",

"pluralistic" and "diversity" when referenced to a whole pool of potential "distinctive minorities"(Edelman, 1977). Women, for example, are the physical majority of this nation, regardless of race. They only become a "distinctive minority" in policy making when the economic fact of making 1/3 less pay for comparable work is demonstrated. Similarly, the white poverty stricken child in a remote rural location is equally disadvantaged with the Black or Hispanic child in the inner city. Generic children at risk policies force us to confront the relationship of race and economics in all specific policy rationalizations.

The second policy implication of this study concerns the pragmatic reality of statewide mandates implemented over time. Richard Elmore(1983a) argues persuasively that original policy intent does not explain actual meanings after policy is implemented in complex organization. Cogent expectations of intent are "factored"(March and Simon, 1958) throughout implementation until actual meanings of policy are incorporated into the operations of many dissipative subunits of interpretation. The actual outcomes of implemented policy may bear little resemblance to the logic behind a mandated condition for change(Pressman and Wildavsky, 1984). Indeed, one superintendent in the survey pool indicated he or she would not complete this questionnaire because the "curriculum of inclusion" meant special education students being mainstreamed out of BOCES arrangements and back into district jurisdictions for cost saving reasons. While the word "inclusion" remains a historical artifact that forty one superintendents could identify enough to fill out a questionnaire, at least one of the nonwhite pupil administrator had an entirely different meaning based upon economic events of the last two years.

The economic implications in fulfilling mandate requirements should not be overlooked as a 1990's pragmatic. The fiscal "shortfalls" in operating budgets during Fall 1990 and 1991 have created a climate of pessimism over the ability to accurately project state revenues from year to year. Superintendents tend to distinguish curriculum mandates in terms of "costly" and "noncostly". Attention is given to the most expensive mandated operations(eg. special education standards)and the results is less monitoring of the "noncost" changes such as inclusion curriculum (Kearns, 1992). In this study, three responding superintendents felt that the state would pay little attention to the oversite of a two year old inclusion mandate and this neglect would remain as long as fiscal hard times continued.

The final implication concerns the use of perceptions in policy study, as opposed to the documentation of actual behavior or performance by an external source. For example, the High School and Beyond national data base identifies "rural" principals according to the classification the respondent gives(Jacobson and Wentworth, 1991). The Regional Laboratory for Educational Improvement in the Northeast and the Islands also allows participating districts to self identify as "rural"(Rural Education: Issues and Strategies, April, 1992). While such looseness in identity is politically understandable in light of the history of arbitrary classification such as "nonmetropolitan area" it sets a dangerous precedent of too much overgeneralization and abstraction(Sher, 1977). This study used a wealth capacity(.5 CWR) and remoteness standard (+/-15 pupils per square mile) to establish the parameters of the special population under study. Without such grounding, the use of New York City average CWR or zip code locators to subdivide the "upstate" into four areas would be less contextually relevant(Elmore, 1983b). Such

grounding seems critical to evaluate recent reorganization of the State Education Department or efforts to consolidate and eliminate small k-12 districts. reorganization and shared services in "upstate."

Future research could consider the results of this study as a hypotheses framing venture for the study of perceptions about policy implementation. Systematic differences in perception identified by this effort could be considered in framing comparative studies of administrators representing k-12 districts that contain significant minority pupil populations, districts that vary dramatically in percent of budget expenditures for instruction and academic outcomes(eg. Regent diplomas) by school site within district or by comparing perceptions of nonminority administrators with teachers, students and parents from the same type of jurisdiction .

References

Center for the Future of Children. Children at Risk (Los Altos: Packard Foundation, 1992)

Cibulka, James, et. al., The Politics of Urban Education(New York: Falmer Press, 1992)

Comptroller of the State of New York, Special Report on Municipal Affairs for the Fiscal Year Ending 1990(released December 1991)

Edleman, M. Words that Succeed And Policies That Fail (New York: Academic Press, 1977)

Edsall, T. Chain Reaction (New York: Norton, 1991)

Ehrenhalt,S. Profile of a Recession:The New York Experience in the Early 1990's (Albany: Rockefeller Institute, 1992)

Elmore, Richard " Forward and Backward Mapping: Reversible Logics in the Analysis of Public Policy" (ERIC Document 258 011, June 1983a)

Elmore, Richard "Social Policymaking as Strategic Intervention" in Seidman,E.(ed) Handbook of Social Intervention (Beverley Hills: Sage, 1983b)

Geller, Henry and Johnston, Perry, "Researching Policy Implementation: Lessons From the Past" (paper presented at American Educational Research Association, Chicago, 1991)

Haller, Eric and Monk David "New Reforms, Old Reforms and the Consolidation of Small Rural Schools"Educational Administration Quarterly(Volume 24, November 1988 pp 470-483)

Jacobson, Stephen and Woodworth, Beth "School Based Management: What Administrators Think" (paper presented at the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, 1991)

Kearns, Barbara"Analysis of Perceptions of State Mandates by Superintendents in New York"(unpublished doctoral dissertation, University at Albany, May 1992)

Kozol, Jonathan Death at an Early Age(New York: Basic, 1967)

Kozol, Jonathan Savage Inequalities(New York: Simon and Schuster, 1991)

Meyers, J. et al., "Centralization, Fragmentation and School District Complexity",Administrative Science Quarterly Volume 32, 1987, pp. 188-201)

New York Board of Regents and State Education Department New York: State of Learning (Albany: 1990-1991, 1991-1992)

New York Board of Regents and State Education Department Rural Education: Issues and Strategies(Albany, April 1992)

New York State Legislative Commission on Rural Resources, The Structure, Function and Financing of Local Government(Albany, August, 1991)

Pressman, Jeffrey and Wildavsky, Aaron Implementation (Berkeley:University of California, 1984, third edition)

Sher, Jonathan(ed) Revitalizing Rural America (Boulder: Westview Press, 1977)

Spring, Joel Conflict of Interests (New York:Longmans, 1992)

Upstate New York Districts Involved in " Inclusion" Study: Appendix A
Subdivided by Zip Code Locators(Three Places) into Four Regions

All Nonminority Districts (N=139*)

	West	South/Central	East	North
Zip	140,141,142	130,131	120,121	129
	n=13	n=10	n=15	n=13
Zip	144,147,148	133,134	128	136
	n=25	n=19	n=17	n=15
Zip		137,138		
		n=12		
District Totals	38	41	32	28

* note: Shelter Island and Fisher Island of Suffolk County on Long Island not included in upstate zip code totals

---

Nonminority Districts Sent Survey(n=62)

	West	South/Central	East	North
Zip	140,141,142	130,131	120,121	129
	n=8	n=7	n=5	n=5
Zip	144,147,148	133,134	128	136
	n=10	n=7	n=7	n=5
Zip		137, 138		
		n=6		
District Totals	18	20	12	10

Upstate Districts Responding to Survey (n=40)

	West	South/Central	East	North
Zip	140,141,142	130,131	120,121	129
	n=6	n=4	n=3	n=4
Zip	144,147,148	133,134	128	136
	n=8	n=5	n=6	n=2
Zip		137,138		
		n=2		
District Totals	14	11	9	6

**note: Fisher Island of downstate Suffolk County also responded but not calculated in upstate analysis

Comparisons of Inclusion Survey Respondants to Different Meanings of New York State Schooling (1991)

Appendix B

	Combined Wealth Ratio			Dollars Per Child (ADM)		
	minimum	average	maximum	minimum	average	maximum
Total State		1.0			$6908	
New York City		0.9			$6609	
State Model(647)	.21	.95	9.26	$4348	$6844	$24,023
All White (141)	.27	.67	9.26	$4412	$5971	$19,220
Respondants(41)	.27	.89	9.26	$4430	$5916	$10,900

	Fall Enrollment			% Free or Reduced Lunches		
	minimum	average	maximum	minimum	average	maximum
Total State		2,547,258			35.1	
New York City		931,910			62.2	
State Model(647)	66	2423	45197	0.1	20.5	71.4
All White(141)	66	1073	4184	6.0	26.2	50.9
Respondants(41)	66	1111	4184	6.6	25.6	50.9

	% Regent Diplomas			Remoteness(CAADM/ SQ. Mi)		
	minimum	average	maximum	minimum	average	maximum
Total State		38.0				
New York City		22.3				
State Model(647)	0	40.1	74.3	0.33	152.7	1856.0
All White(141)	6.7	37.8	66.7	0.33	24.7	611.32
Respondants(41)	16.9	38.3	64.1	0.77	40.2	611.32

	% Dropout			% Spent on Instruction		
	minimum	average	maximum	minimum	average	maximum
Total State		4.9			62	
New York City		7.8			63	
State Model(647)	0	2.6	13.6	34	58.9	70
All White(141)	0	2.6	7.8	34	59.3	69
Respondants(41)	0	2.4	6.4	47	58.7	66

Note: All information for Total State and New York City provided by State Education Department report New York: State of Learning, submitted to the Governor and Legislature, February 1992

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

	COUNTY	ENROL	DROP	FREE	REG	$CAADM	INST	Aera	CWR	+/-.5 CWR	-15 Dense	Zip Area	Zip code
1	Albany	1192	1.4	15.3	16.9	5274	58	9.78	.64	Over	Yes	East	1 (20-21)
2	Alleg	678	1.5	44.7	42.5	5446	63	13.70	.36	Under	Yes	West	8 (44,47...
3	Alleg	371	1.9	47.7	33.3	5734	61	8.40	.27	Under	Yes	West	8 (44,47...
4	Alleg	332	0	37.0	40.9	5157	60	6.47	.39	Under	Yes	West	8 (44,47...
5	Broome	1187	2.6	19.9	41.4	5754	52	14.28	.39	Under	Yes	South...	7 (37-38)
6	Broome	2022	2.8	29.8	38.8	4430	65	13.54	.39	Under	Yes	South...	7 (37-38)
7	Cattarugus	687	.5	•	31.1	5282	54	5.77	.75	Over	Yes	West	8 (44,47...
8	Cayuga	1329	5.8	27.2	40.3	5464	61	17.57	.41	Under	No	South...	6 (30,31)
9	Chautagua	1437	2.8	20.7	49.4	4856	47	19.98	.60	Over	No	West	8 (44,47...
10	Chenango	399	3.6	28.3	27.3	5074	56	9.90	.42	Under	Yes	South...	7 (37-38)
11	Clinton	1194	6.3	34.2	18.2	5474	58	3.12	.40	Under	Yes	North	3 (29)
12	Cortland	734	5.1	38.3	34.4	5614	50	5.53	.34	Under	Yes	South...	6 (30,31)
13	Erie	4184	2.6	15.1	26.8	5987	62	122.27	.87	Over	No	West	9 (40,4...
14	Erie	1180	2.0	35.7	41.5	5868	65	417.45	.91	Over	No	West	9 (40,4...
15	Erie	1839	1.2	9.0	52.5	6082	60	57.97	1.22	Over	No	West	9 (40,4...
16	Erie	2293	3.5	19.9	40.1	5514	60	15.34	.59	Over	No	West	9 (40,4...
17	Erie	2626	3.3	22.6	33.5	5854	64	611.32	.65	Over	No	West	9 (40,4...
18	Erie	2505	1.1	8.8	53.2	6323	61	31.45	.79	Over	No	West	9 (40,4...
19	Essex	163	0	50.9	27.3	10900	54	1.18	.83	Over	Yes	East	2 (28)
20	Essex	164	0	18.9	50.0	8063	55	1.14	1.43	Over	Yes	North	3 (29)
21	Essex	271	0	38.4	47.4	6553	57	.80	1.81	Over	Yes	East	2 (28)
22	Franklin	1057	1.7	22.8	37.3	5414	64	3.54	.63	Over	Yes	North	3 (29)
23	Franklin	386	3.2	37.7	20.0	6548	63	1.79	.42	Under	Yes	North	3 (29)
24	Fulton	639	2.4	23.2	64.1	5513	61	4.37	.64	Over	Yes	East	1 (20-21)
25	Fulton	552	6.4	34.2	29.2	5164	61	6.32	.42	Under	Yes	South...	5 (33,34)
26	Hamilton	233	3.3	15.9	33.3	8514	53	.77	1.68	Over	Yes	East	2 (28)
27	Herkimer	736	4.0	34.2	29.7	6138	56	1.53	.69	Over	Yes	South...	5 (33,34)
28	Herkimer	1174	1.4	18.3	53.4	5013	64	26.74	.38	Under	No	South...	5 (33,34)
29	Jefferson	366	3.7	25.1	60.9	6491	61	5.82	.66	Over	Yes	North	4 (36)
30	Oneida	3703	3.4	8.9	45.3	5543	61	86.47	.75	Over	No	South...	5 (33,34)
31	Onondaga	1676	1.7	6.6	60.6	6133	60	21.95	1.05	Over	No	South...	6 (30,31)
32	Onondaga	868	1.7	16.2	37.3	5515	57	6.78	.60	Over	Yes	South...	6 (30,31)
33	Ostego	1291	1.2	13.4	45.3	4848	59	12.86	.82	Over	Yes	South...	5 (33,34)
34	Rensselaer	1051	1.5	8.1	37.7	5759	59	32.19	.74	Over	No	East	1 (20-21)
35	St Law	579	.7	33.2	35.3	5014	61	6.02	.34	Under	Yes	North	4 (36)
36	Steuben	742	2.0	23.6	52.9	5383	51	17.58	.33	Under	No	West	8 (44,47...
37	Steuben	1449	4.5	39.7	35.7	5665	58	8.85	.36	Under	Yes	West	8 (44,47...
38	Steuben	675	1.0	•	25.0	5637	57	4.87	.32	Under	Yes	West	8 (44,47...
39	Warren	451	2.2	37.5	20.0	7155	66	2.39	.69	Over	Yes	East	2 (28)
40	Warren	642	1.4	16.4	25.7	6861	51	4.21	1.01	Over	Yes	East	2 (28)
41	Washington	518	4.7	21.2	35.1	5562	61	8.60	.37	Under	Yes	East	2 (28)

Diversity Curriculum in Public Schools Without Minority Pupils

The searing description of inner city education, presented by Jonathan Kozol in Savage Inequalities (1991), argues for the discussion of "at risk" schools to emphasize race and ethnicity within American society. The racial discrimination, isolation and underfunding Kozol described public schooling in the mid 1960's (Death at an Early Age, 1967) has only intensified in its savagery for urban children during the subsequent three decades. The official report of the "condition of education" by the New York State Education Department provides a more abstract and less passionate confirmation of the same assertion: that public education operates as;

> "two systems, one rich, white and performing well; the other poor, of color and failing academically."
> (Commissioner's Preface, New York State of Learning, 1991)

Thus, inner city and poverty are descriptions of poor performing school children, while underfunding and race become the perceived realities of what creates the "at risk" aspect of the schooling environment.

The same undercurrents of race, poverty and inner city explain the rationale behind a mandated curriculum for the topic of "diversity." In 1987, the New York Commissioner of Education created a task force to study the teaching of history in social studies. Three years later, the Board of Regents approved an recommendation that the teaching of history be "inclusive" and reflect American pluralism by including the contributions of all minorities to the development of the country. Implementation of the mandate in New York schools since 1991 has created a subsequent discussion of what is known as the curriculum of inclusion. Spin off terminology includes multicultural, mosiac, foreign, Eurocentric or Afrocentric, pluralism and

democracy. General discussion of either diversity or inclusion is often emotional and confrontational, as language distinctions substitute for policies that succeed or fail in particular contexts.

Three economic driven issues left unsolved at the time of approval were (1) whether money disadvantage was strictly an urban phenomenon, (2) the relationship of poverty to children labelled minority and (3)the relationship of being poor to being educationally disadvantaged. While not downplaying the Kozol type argument for city environments, there has been growing recognition that economic driven issues are prevalent in the most remote rural parts of the state, where the inequality of being poor is every bit as savage, but where virtually all the children in school are not labelled minority. This fact makes the real economic definition of "disadvantaged" in New York a bimodal distribution, with suburbs deemed affluent and not in the equation; the poverty of cities highly visable on one end and the often ignored, invisable rural inequalities on the other . This suggests the curriculum base of the diversity issues may provide a surface sheen to the deeper currents of redistributive economic politics or "clout" that pit the cities versus the rural countryside, especially in "urban" states like New York(Cibulka, 1992). If poverty is the real underpinning for the rationale of disadvantaged and schooling ,a poor child is not any better or worse off because of the proportionate numbers of others suffering the same fate in a big city or a small township. Each child has the same "inclusive" right to quality public schooling, regardless of geographic and demographic context.

Another type of fiscal condition that has affected the implementation of curriculum of inclusion, was the dramatic economic recession statewide(Ehrenhalt, 1992). The Board of Regents approved the inclusion mandate as part

of a major educational reform agenda called the Compact for Learning. In the two years since approval, there have been few monies to undertake the fundamental transformation of existing curriculums. Given the general problem of guaranteeing a connection between policy intent and actual implementation in any complex organization(Geller and Johnston, 1990, Commission on Rural Resources, 1992), it is possible that diversity aspects of social studies entered the teaching of history in a staggered fashion. The dissipative tendencies of implementation itself transforms the communicated meaning to endpoint interpretation. The more decentralized the implementation of a policy mandate, the more the accountability for actual operation is a grassroots phenomenon(Elmore, 1983a). In New York State public education there are more than seven hundred school districts. It is of no surprise that a large percent of minority pupil populations are related to the handful of districts in big city and urban settings, but the actual extent of concentration is not always appreciated. New York State educated over 2.5 million public school children in 1990-91 and nearly one forth were Black or Hispanic(24.4%). Yet, the five big cities of New York(City, Buffalo, Rochester, Syracuse, Yonkers)schooled four of five of all Black students and nine of ten of all Hispanic students.

The rest of these particular minorities, spread out in the 700 other k-12 districts throughout the state, numbered less than 150,000 or under one percent of the 1.4 million non big city students. Given such dispersion, it seems fair to speculate that some non urban k-12 districts may be viewing the "curriculum of inclusion" mandate as perhaps, a "frill" in relation to other mandated responsibilities in academic year 1992-93. While inclusion of diversity emphasis in the teaching of social studies may not cost much in

dollars, its much touted "urban" relationship to race and ethnicity could make it be perceived as less vital in those districts without significant minority student populations. In New York, there are 141 k-12 districts (housing over 150,000 students) that report less than one percent "minority" pupils enrolled and 98.6% of these districts with virtually are located in "nonmetropolitan" settings.

Statement of the Problem

The basic purposes of this study were to ascertain what the curriculum of inclusion meant for the administrative leaders of select New York districts at the start of the 1992-93 school year. First, how special were the demographic characteristics of k-12 jurisdictions that enrolled only nonminority students? Second, did administrators in all white pupil settings exhibit commitment to the responsibility of implementing the statewide "inclusion" mandate and, if so, were race and ethnicity perceived as the intellectual cornerstones in the modified history curriculum ? Third , did the general opinions about inclusion vary where the combined wealth ratios for nonminority districts were worse than half the state average ? Fourth, did general opinions vary by geographic location of nonminority districts in different parts of "upstate" New York? Finally, what specific groupings of people other than Afro American and Hispanic were be identified as "distinctive" enough to be a minority for curriculum with a diversity focus?

A delimitation of the study is asking the chief school officer of a district about the status of any curriculum being implemented by teachers in classrooms. All perceptual analyses appear frail compared to physical documentation of actual performances, and this frailty seems exacerbated by the difference in organizational roles. On the other hand, the chief

administrator is responsible to the Board of Education for implementing the academic program(Elmore, 1983b) and, especially in smaller districts, can sense the general tenor of what a potentially controversial curriculum might be providing(Meyers, et.al.,1987). In this particular study, 90 percent of responding superintendents were administering districts with less than 2000 children in grades k-12 and the average size of all districts represented by the study was 1111 in grades k-12.

Methodology

To appreciate the specialness of nonminority districts in New York State, the k-12 jurisdictions that enrolled 99 percent of more white pupils were compared to the statewide average (from State Education Department statistics and a model containing 647 jurisdictions without New York city and districts with less than a full k-12 grade complement) and to New York City as a separate jurisdiction. All demographic information used to compare the "nonminority" set of k-12 district jurisdictions were collected from official sources of the State Education Department(1990,1991, 1991-92) and Office of the State Comptroller(released December 1991).

The poverty measure used to classify an individual district was made of the combined wealth ratio and the dollars spent for each child in average daily membership. The Combined Wealth Ratio(hereafter CWR) , a combination of property and personal income values used in educational state aid formula calculations, was identified as a measure of general wealth capability . Dollars spent per child in average daily membership (hereafter $CAADM) was identified as a measure of fiscal effort made to support the educational enterprise. Because the "urban" emphasis of the curriculum of inclusion generated this particular study, the economic condition of New York City was

used as benchmark for comparing the relative poverty of nonminority k-12 districts of New York. New York City has a CWR of 0.9, less than the statewide average of 1.0 and, in 1991, spent $6609 per child in average daily attendance which is also less than the state average of $6908. However,126 of 141 or 89% of the nonminority districts in this study had less than the New York City CWR of 0.9 and spent less than $6609 per child.

With two exceptions, the New York districts with no minority pupils are located "upstate", north of the Catskill Recreation Park. Using zip codes as a common locator reference for individual districts, four geographic areas of "upstate" were identified. The West area contained thirty eight districts, South/Central contained forty one districts, the North area contained twenty eight districts and the East area contained twenty eight districts.

A sample of 62 of the 141 superintendents were selected for collection by stratifying both economic indication and the geographic location by the four areas of upstate. The decision rules for an acceptable survey response was a return rate of better than 60%, at least seven districts above the indices of CWR and $CAADM, and a minimum of six responses from each of the four upstate areas with at least two responses from each individual zip code clustering. The 41 usable returns represent a 66% overall return rate and satisfied the other decision criteria(see Appendix A).

The survey was constructed by reviewing the newspaper coverage of the 1990 "inclusion" controversy, histories of the war on poverty, desegregation, the philosophy of diversity and translating basic points into questionnaire items. The questionnaire was pilot tested for clarity and face validity by three superintendents in full time graduate study at The University at Albany in Spring 1992. Part one consisted of general statements to agree or

disagree with. Words utilized in specific item construction included distinctiveness, diverse, economically disadvantaged, educationally disadvantaged, inner city, children of color, ethnicity, race, urban, multicultural, Eurocentric, Afrocentric, equity, political correctness and pluralism. Questions about the foreign aspects of Canada, India and learning a language other than English were also included. Part two asked for two independent assessments of sixteen groups that could possibly be called "distinctive." The superintendents were first asked whether they personally felt a group had a legitimate claim to being identified as distinctive. They were then asked to reassess all the groups as to whether some were actually being expressed in the ongoing curriculum of inclusion for academic year 1992-1993. The groupings contained ethnic reference(Native Americans Asians, people from Caribbean, Central Americans),social status(young children, elderly, military, homeless), economic(unemployed, retired, migrants,veterans) and special populations(HIV Positive, women, disabled) that could conceivably be perceived as "distinct" enough for the curriculum of inclusion.

For a conservative posture in interpreting differences in perception, the ten point response scale was collapsed to a three place categorization; responses 1 through 3 were "agree", 4 through 7 as "unsure" and 8 through 10 were "disagree." Chi square analyses utilized the three response classification of raw data to compare districts by poverty and location differences.

The All White Pupil Districts in New York State

Appendix **B** documents that the Combined Wealth Ratio(CWR) is particularly suited to establishing the poverty claim as it correlates with dollars spent per average membership child($CAADM) at .89 (correlation squared, .79 as gross measure of systematic variation accounted for) of the nonminority districts of New York. The less capability to support a schooling program with personal and property income, the less spent on children in average daily membership. Other descriptions used to further identify the "nonminority districts" of New York were percent of children receiving free or reduced fee lunches, the enrollment, process variable of percent of expenditures spent on instructions , the outcome variable of advanced graduation diploma(ie.Regent) percentage and the remoteness of the jurisdiction as the enrolled pupils are divided by square miles.

While the average percent of children on free or reduced lunches is somewhat higher for the nonminority districts than the total state, the nonminority district with the highest percent is less than 51 compared to several other districts in the state with more than sixty percent participation. The enrollment of nonminority districts averages close to 1100 pupils in grades k-12 compared to the statewide model average of close to 2,500. We must remember the "upstate" nature of the nonminority districts and the relative relationship of such district jurisdictions to New York City with more than 930,000 students and the other Big Four city districts that average 38,000 pupils. The production function aspect of percent of expenditures spent on instructional activities finds the nonminority districts considerably below the official statewide average (but same as statistical state model) and New York City average. The output variable of Regent Diploma graduates finds the

nonminority districts with the same percent as the official state average, ahead of New York City and below the statistical state model.

Finally, we see that none of the nonminority group of districts has a density of more than 650 pupils per square mile and, in fact, the majority are less than 25 children per square mile(actual average is 24.77). The statewide model average is 152.71 and the New York City district, in which 931,000 children attend in 307 square miles, has a density of 3032.

We can conclude that the nonminority districts in New York State demand a special population analysis; a study to provide a set of findings about this particular district jurisdictions that cannot be generalized to statewide policy or New York City policy. Beyond the obvious specialness of a virtual lack of minority students compared to a state average of 13 percent and the New York City average of 31 percent, the systematic study of the nonminority district respondents demands specific information be given on all descriptive variables, analytical categories and responses to those key questions concerning race and ethnicity that underlie the methodological construction. Appendix **C** profiles the core demographic characteristics of the 41 respondent jurisdictions(coded by county of location).

General Feelings About Implementing the Curriculum of Inclusion

As a group, the superintendents of nonminority districts were virtually unanimous (Yes 39, Unsure 0, No 1) on only one item on the survey; " **economic disadvantaged pupil** is a concept as appropriate for the discussion of remote rural schooling settings as it is for the dense inner city." There was, however, strong agreement (Yes 28, Unsure 10 ,No 3) about "districts or buildings where the pupils are virtually all white find a greater difficulty in learning and appreciating **diversity** than in jurisdictions where the student

body is 25 percent or less white", that (Yes 32,Unsure 5 ,No 3) "issues of **multicultural** have been translated as urban concerns, primarily about Black and Hispanic groupings" and that (Yes 30,Unsure 8, No 1) the " British Isles, Scandinavia, France, Germany and much of Eastern Europe would all qualify as the roots of 'Eurocentric' thinking." The responding superintendents also registered agreement in not affirming that (Yes 4,Unsure 6, No 20)"sensitivity to **democratic values** in 1990's America means our primary consideration must be to race and ethnicity issues."

There was a definite mix of opinion among the upstate superintendents (Yes 20,Unsure 5 ,No 15) whether "the most common use of the term **educationally disadvantaged pupils** means poorly performing inner city children of color", whether (Yes 21, Unsure 0,No 19) "all children that graduate from my district should be able to understand a **foreign** language" and whether (Yes 14, Unsure 10 ,No 16) "mandating a curriculum of **inclusion** was vital to guarantee that New York children understand the distinct and diverse nature of our society."

In general, concepts about the realities of rural poverty and classification of inner city school environment by race of pupils were confirmed in the perceptions of the upstate superintendents. The perceived difference between economic and educational disadvantage was pronounced, as was the impression that multicultural and diversity meant nonwhite pupils, and that the idea of democracy should not be reduced to a simple question of race and ethnicity. The distinction between the time of the 1991 Regent mandate to require the teaching of the inclusion curriculum and the time frame of this administrator's study(Fall 1992) may be reflected in the surprising split in feelings about foreign language for graduation and the curriculum of

inclusion. The negative or no answers may reflect the strains from implementing increased curriculum and graduation requirements in an era of shrinking fiscal resources. Since 1991, superintendents throughout New York have petitioned the Board of Regents for variances to a variety of curriculum requirements on grounds of lacking resources to achieve full implementation.

The forty one upstate superintendents were first asked to indicate the group or groups they felt had the "most legitimate claim to being a distinctive minority" and, second, whether that grouping was actually included in the social studies curriculum for Academic Year 1992-1993. The superintendents were in strong agreement that **Disabled** (Yes 29,Unsure 4,No 7), **New York Native Americans** (Yes 29, Unsure 4 ,No 7) Native Americans throughout the nation(Yes 28,Unsure 5,No 7) and **Asians** (Yes 27,Unsure 5 ,No 8) were "distinctive enough" minorities for addition to an inclusion curriculum. Superintendents felt strongly that Asians (Yes 24,Unsure 11,No 5) and New York Native Americans(Yes 27,Unsure 8,No 5) were being expressly covered in the on going 1992-1993 curriculum for their districts

They also had strong opinions that **military personnel**(Yes 4,Unsure 7, No 29) and **children under the school age** (Yes 6,Unsure 6,No 28) should <u>not</u> be a distinctive minority. Superintendents also felt both these groups and the **unemployed** (Yes 4,Unsurel4, No 22) were not in the 1992-1993 inclusion curriculum.

Groupings that generated the most mixed opinions about the claim of "distinctive minority' included **elderly** (Yes 16,Unsure 7,No 17),**homeless** (Yes 18,Unsure 6,No 14) and **people with HIV Positive** virus (Yes 17,Unsure 6,

No 17). Groups that the superintendents were most unsure about inclusion in the present social studies curriculum were **people from Caribbean** (Yes 14, Unsure 12 ,No 14) and **migrant workers** (Yes 12,Unsure 14, No 14).

It would seem that the ethnicity of Asians and Native Americans plays the strongest claim for legitimacy as a "distinctive" minorities when Afro American and Hispanic labels are controlled. It is interesting that the classification of people living in the Caribbean area did not seem to carry an automatic race or ethnicity reference. Similarly, it is interesting that Disabled were strongly identified as being a distinctive minority, but feelings were mixed about sick people infected with HIV Positive virus. In terms of socio-economic classifications, the response to pre school children was more negative than to elderly and more negative to unemployed than to migrant workers. It is interesting that the upstate superintendents felt more positive about including homeless than military personnel under the "distinctive minority" label.

Do Responses Differ By Economics?

To deal with the question of whether the general economic condition of districts systematically affected the perceptual responses of superintendents, a benchmark of 0.5 CWR (1/2 the state average and slightly below the nonminority group average of .66) was used to divide the nonminority jurisdictions into two groups; 24 "over" and 17 "under." Chi square analysis of all general items, distinctive minority items and inclusion in the 1992-93 curriculum items found only one question where the 0.5 CWR systematically discriminated at better than the 95 percent level of statistical confidence. Given the special population grouping of all nonminority districts and total range of all combined wealth ratios of this group as .27 through 1.81 , the

lack of sharp differences in chi square analysis was not unexpected. Yet, on the question of whether the **unemployed** group should be considered a distinctive minority the "over" group (Yes 3, Unsure 5, No 16) differed significantly (chi square 9.39, probability .009) with the perceptions of superintendents from the "under" group(Yes 9, Unsure 4, No 4). We can conclude that unemployed persons are a direct reflection of general economics and that superintendents from districts with less than .5 CWR were more inclined to include this classification than superintendents from districts above .5 CWR.

Do Responses Differ by Location in Upstate?

Remoteness and regionalism are two topics of considerable interest in New York State policy. Remoteness usually refers to small k-12 districts located in out of the way rural areas and the strong pressure by the Governor and Board of Regents to consolidate and eliminate these jurisdictions(Haller and Monk, 1988). Regionalism usually refers to attempts to provide shared services on an "area" basis, either by an intermediate education government (eg boards of Cooperative Educational Services) or county municipality.

To provide a benchmark for discussing "upstate" as a geographic reference to "remote" location, the standard of 15 pupils per square mile (hereafter CAADM/ SQ MI) created an "over" group of 28 and an "under" group of 13 respondents. This standard is considerably less than the nonminority group average of 40. 5 (see Appendix B) and the classification of 25 CAADM/SQ MI used by the New York State Legislative Commission on Rural Resources (1991) to discuss remote rural jurisdictions. Chi square analyses of superintendent responses using the .05 level of statistical significance identified four items where remoteness creates systematic variation. In

response to the item, " sensitivity to **democratic values** in 1990's America means our primary consideration must be to race and ethnicity, " the "over 15" group (Yes 4, Unsure 5, No 4) and the "under 15" group (Yes 1,Unsure 11, No 16) were found statistically significant (chi square, 6.55, probability .03). The general remoteness classification also distinguished three groupings of claims to be a distinctive minority; women, migrant workers and people sick with HIV Positive virus. The "over 15" group (Yes 4, Unsure 4,No 5) differed from the "under 15"(Yes 7, Unsure 1, No 20) group of respondents on whether **women** should be a distinctive minority for the curriculum of inclusion(chi square 7.07, probability .02). Remoteness classification also differentiated feelings about **migrant workers**(chi square 7.06, probability .02) between the "over 15"(Yes 7 Unsure 5, No 1) and "under 15" (Yes 13, Unsure 3, Disagree 12) groups. The inclusion of **people sick with HIV Positive virus** as a distinctive minority created a statistically significant response rate(chi square 11.50, probability .003) between "over 15" (Yes 4, Unsure 6, No 3) and "under 15 " groups (Yes 13, Unsure 1, No 14)of superintendents.

Administrators representing k-12 jurisdictions with less than 15 CAADM/Square Mile seemed more negative toward the ideas of race and ethnicity being a primary concern in democratic values, or the inclusion of women and migrant workers as distinctive minority groups, than their counterparts in districts above 15 CAADM/Square Mile. Difference of opinions about victims of HIV Positive seemed due to the larger numbers of "unsure" responses in the over 15 group. We can conclude that remoteness as a generalized phenomenon does have some impact on feelings affecting the meanings of curriculum of inclusion.

The second question about location utilized zip codes to identify geographic proximity as the "upstate" New York was divided into four areas. The West area included districts from six zip locators(140,141,142, 144, 147, 148), the South Central from six zip locators(130, 131, 133, 134, 137, 138), the East from three zip locators(120. 121, 128) and the North from two zip locators(129,136). While native New Yorkers are likely to debate whether particular area differences outweigh general area classifications for certain zip code locations(eg. the 128 zip as East instead of North or the 137/138 as distinctly different and separate West "cultures" from the 144/147/148), the four area format used insured the entire upstate was represented by a minimum number of superintendent responses.

The geographic area of the upstate differentiated a statistically significant response (chi square 14.23, probability .02) to "districts where pupils are virtually **all white** find a greater difficulty learning and appreciating diversity than jurisdictions where the student body is 25 or less white." A larger number of unsure responses in the West (Yes 6, Unsure 7, No 0) seemed to distinguish it from the South/Central(Yes 8, Unsure 2, Nol), East (Yes 9, Unsure 0, No 0) and North (Yes 5, Unsure 0, No 1) areas. The geographic location also differentiated the subgroups of superintendents by perceptions of what minorities were included in the 1992-92 curriculum. **Homeless**(chi square 14.24, probability .02) seemed more likely to be in the inclusion curriculum in the West (Yes 3, Unsure 7, No 3) and East (Yes 3, Unsure 0, No 6) than the South/Central (Yes 0 Unsure 4, No 7) or North (Yes 0, Unsure 1, No 6) area. **Children under school age**(chi square 15.64, probability .01) seemed more likely to be found in the West (Yes 3, Unsure 6, No 4) than the South/Central (Yes 0, Unsure 5, No 6), East (Yes 0, Unsure 0, No 9) or

the North (Yes 0, Unsure 1, No 5) parts of upstate New York. While the systemic variation on certain items indicates the West is different from the rest of upstate New York, caution should be used for policy interpretations. The major distinction in response patterns seems to be the extent that superintendents in the West were (proportionately) unsure of certain classifications.

Conclusions and Policy Implications

The primary implication of this study of administrator perceptions is the qualitative distinction between the meaning of disadvantaged when referenced to race and disadvantaged considered as a focus to questions of poverty. The "curriculum of inclusion" controversy of Spring 1990 presented the issue of "diversity" in as a racial and urban concern. The reason Black and Hispanic minorities were identified as the direct reflection of "diversity" controversy was more a function of political mobilization of claims to being disadvantaged than philosophical rationalization of the social studies curriculum. These same interest groups were instrumental in the political evolution of urban, big city politics for the past thirty years(Spring 1992). While it seems fair to conclude that the genesis of much of the inclusion controversy of Spring 1990 was also embedded in the policy ferment for desegregation of races in schools and the civil rights implications of Great Society policies (Edsall, 1992), being disadvantaged for poverty reasons in the 1990's is part of the "diversity" discussion of all children (Center for the Future of Children, 1992). The disadvantage of being poor is not delimited to living in an urban area or being nonwhite.

The recognition of multiple meanings of disadvantaged seems the perceptual cornerstone for making sense of words like "multicultural",

"pluralistic" and "diversity" when referenced to a whole pool of potential "distinctive minorities"(Edelman, 1977). Women, for example, are the physical majority of this nation, regardless of race. They only become a "distinctive minority" in policy making when the economic fact of making 1/3 less pay for comparable work is demonstrated. Similarly, the white poverty stricken child in a remote rural location is equally disadvantaged with the Black or Hispanic child in the inner city. Generic children at risk policies force us to confront the relationship of race and economics in all specific policy rationalizations.

The second policy implication of this study concerns the pragmatic reality of statewide mandates implemented over time. Richard Elmore(1983a) argues persuasively that original policy intent does not explain actual meanings after policy is implemented in complex organization. Cogent expectations of intent are "factored"(March and Simon, 1958) throughout implementation until actual meanings of policy are incorporated into the operations of many dissipative subunits of interpretation. The actual outcomes of implemented policy may bear little resemblance to the logic behind a mandated condition for change(Pressman and Wildavsky, 1984). Indeed, one superintendent in the survey pool indicated he or she would not complete this questionnaire because the "curriculum of inclusion" meant special education students being mainstreamed out of BOCES arrangements and back into district jurisdictions for cost saving reasons. While the word "inclusion" remains a historical artifact that forty one superintendents could identify enough to fill out a questionnaire, at least one of the nonwhite pupil administrator had an entirely different meaning based upon economic events of the last two years.

The economic implications in fulfilling mandate requirements should not be overlooked as a 1990's pragmatic. The fiscal "shortfalls" in operating budgets during Fall 1990 and 1991 have created a climate of pessimism over the ability to accurately project state revenues from year to year. Superintendents tend to distinguish curriculum mandates in terms of "costly" and "noncostly". Attention is given to the most expensive mandated operations(eg. special education standards)and the results is less monitoring of the "noncost" changes such as inclusion curriculum (Kearns, 1992). In this study, three responding superintendents felt that the state would pay little attention to the oversite of a two year old inclusion mandate and this neglect would remain as long as fiscal hard times continued.

The final implication concerns the use of perceptions in policy study, as opposed to the documentation of actual behavior or performance by an external source. For example, the High School and Beyond national data base identifies "rural" principals according to the classification the respondent gives(Jacobson and Wentworth, 1991). The Regional Laboratory for Educational Improvement in the Northeast and the Islands also allows participating districts to self identify as "rural"(Rural Education: Issues and Strategies, April, 1992). While such looseness in identity is politically understandable in light of the history of arbitrary classification such as "nonmetropolitan area" it sets a dangerous precedent of too much overgeneralization and abstraction(Sher, 1977). This study used a wealth capacity(.5 CWR) and remoteness standard (+/-15 pupils per square mile) to establish the parameters of the special population under study. Without such grounding, the use of New York City average CWR or zip code locators to subdivide the "upstate" into four areas would be less contextually relevant(Elmore, 1983b). Such

grounding seems critical to evaluate recent reorganization of the State Education Department or efforts to consolidate and eliminate small k-12 districts. reorganization and shared services in "upstate."

Future research could consider the results of this study as a hypotheses framing venture for the study of perceptions about policy implementation. Systematic differences in perception identified by this effort could be considered in framing comparative studies of administrators representing k-12 districts that contain significant minority pupil populations, districts that vary dramatically in percent of budget expenditures for instruction and academic outcomes(eg. Regent diplomas) by school site within district or by comparing perceptions of nonminority administrators with teachers, students and parents from the same type of jurisdiction .

References

Center for the Future of Children. Children at Risk (Los Altos: Packard Foundation, 1992)

Cibulka, James, et. al., The Politics of Urban Education(New York: Falmer Press, 1992)

Comptroller of the State of New York, Special Report on Municipal Affairs for the Fiscal Year Ending 1990(released December 1991)

Edleman, M. Words that Succeed And Policies That Fail (New York: Academic Press, 1977)

Edsall, T. Chain Reaction (New York: Norton, 1991)

Ehrenhalt,S. Profile of a Recession:The New York Experience in the Early 1990's (Albany: Rockefeller Institute, 1992)

Elmore, Richard " Forward and Backward Mapping: Reversible Logics in the Analysis of Public Policy" (ERIC Document 258 011, June 1983a)

Elmore, Richard "Social Policymaking as Strategic Intervention" in Seidman,E.(ed) Handbook of Social Intervention (Beverley Hills: Sage, 1983b)

Geller, Henry and Johnston, Perry, "Researching Policy Implementation: Lessons From the Past" (paper presented at American Educational Research Association, Chicago, 1991)

Haller, Eric and Monk David "New Reforms, Old Reforms and the Consolidation of Small Rural Schools"Educational Administration Quarterly(Volume 24, November 1988 pp 470-483)

Jacobson, Stephen and Woodworth, Beth "School Based Management: What Administrators Think" (paper presented at the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, 1991)

Kearns, Barbara"Analysis of Perceptions of State Mandates by Superintendents in New York"(unpublished doctoral dissertation, University at Albany, May 1992)

Kozol, Jonathan Death at an Early Age(New York: Basic, 1967)

Kozol, Jonathan Savage Inequalities(New York: Simon and Schuster, 1991)

Meyers, J. et al., "Centralization, Fragmentation and School District Complexity",Administrative Science Quarterly Volume 32, 1987, pp. 188-201)

New York Board of Regents and State Education Department New York: State of Learning (Albany: 1990-1991, 1991-1992)

New York Board of Regents and State Education Department Rural Education: Issues and Strategies(Albany, April 1992)

New York State Legislative Commission on Rural Resources, The Structure, Function and Financing of Local Government(Albany, August, 1991)

Pressman, Jeffrey and Wildavsky, Aaron Implementation (Berkeley:University of California, 1984, third edition)

Sher, Jonathan(ed) Revitalizing Rural America (Boulder: Westview Press, 1977)

Spring, Joel Conflict of Interests (New York:Longmans, 1992)

Upstate New York Districts Involved in " Inclusion" Study: Appendix A
Subdivided by Zip Code Locators(Three Places) into Four Regions

All Nonminority Districts (N=139*)

	West	South/Central	East	North
Zip	140,141,142	130,131	120,121	129
	n=13	n=10	n=15	n=13
Zip	144,147,148	133,134	128	136
	n=25	n=19	n=17	n=15
Zip		137,138		
		n=12		
District Totals	38	41	,32	28

* note: Shelter Island and Fisher Island of Suffolk County on Long Island not included in upstate zip code totals

---

Nonminority Districts Sent Survey(n=62)

	West	South/Central	East	North
Zip	140,141,142	130,131	120,121	129
	n=8	n=7	n=5	n=5
Zip	144,147,148	133,134	128	136
	n=10	n=7	n=7	n=5
Zip		137, 138		
		n=6		
District Totals	18	20	12	10

Upstate Districts Responding to Survey (n=40)

	West	South/Central	East	North
Zip	140,141,142	130,131	120,121	129
	n=6	n=4	n=3	n=4
Zip	144,147,148	133,134	128	136
	n=8	n=5	n=6	n=2
Zip		137,138		
		n=2		
District Totals	14	11	9	6

**note: Fisher Island of downstate Suffolk County also responded but not calculated in upstate analysis

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Comparisons of Inclusion Survey Respondants to Different Meanings of New York State Schooling (1991)

Appendix B

	Combined Wealth Ratio			Dollars Per Child (ADM)		
	minimum	average	maximum	minimum	average	maximum
Total State		1.0			$6908	
New York City		0.9			$6609	
State Model(647)	.21	.95	9.26	$4348	$6844	$24,023
All White (141)	.27	.67	9.26	$4412	$5971	$19,220
Respondants(41)	.27	.89	9.26	$4430	$5916	$10,900

	Fall Enrollment			% Free or Reduced Lunches		
	minimum	average	maximum	minimum	average	maximum
Total State		2,547,258			35.1	
New York City		931,910			62.2	
State Model(647)	66	2423	45197	0.1	20.5	71.4
All White(141)	66	1073	4184	6.0	26.2	50.9
Respondants(41)	66	1111	4184	6.6	25.6	50.9

	% Regent Diplomas			Remoteness(CAADM/ SQ. Mi)		
	minimum	average	maximum	minimum	average	maximum
Total State		38.0				
New York City		22.3				
State Model(647)	0	40.1	74.3	0.33	152.7	1856.0
All White(141)	6.7	37.8	66.7	0.33	24.7	611.32
Respondants(41)	16.9	38.3	64.1	0.77	40.2	611.32

	% Dropout			% Spent on Instruction		
	minimum	average	maximum	minimum	average	maximum
Total State		4.9			62	
New York City		7.8			63	
State Model(647)	0	2.6	13.6	34	58.9	70
All White(141)	0	2.6	7.8	34	59.3	69
Respondants(41)	0	2.4	6.4	47	58.7	66

Note: All information for Total State and New York City provided by State Education Department report New York: State of Learning, submitted to the Governor and Legislature, February 1992

	.COUNTY	ENROL	DROP	FREE	REG	$CARDM	INST	Area	CWR	+/-.5 CWR	15 Dense	Zip Area	Zip code
1	Albany	1192	1.4	15.3	16.9	5274	58	9.78	.64	Over	Yes	East	1 (20-21)
2	Alleg	678	1.5	44.7	42.5	5446	63	13.70	.36	Under	Yes	West	8 (44,47...
3	Alleg	371	1.9	47.7	33.3	5734	61	8.40	.27	Under	Yes	West	8 (44,47...
4	Alleg	332	0	37.0	40.9	5157	60	6.47	.39	Under	Yes	West	8 (44,47...
5	Broome	1187	2.6	19.9	41.4	5754	52	14.28	.39	Under	Yes	South...	7 (37-38)
6	Broome	2022	2.8	29.8	38.8	4430	65	13.54	.39	Under	Yes	South...	7 (37-38)
7	Cattarugus	687	.5	•	31.1	5282	54	5.77	.75	Over	Yes	West	8 (44,47...
8	Cayuga	1329	5.8	27.2	40.3	5464	61	17.57	.41	Under	No	South...	6 (30,31)
9	Chautagua	1437	2.8	20.7	49.4	4856	47	19.98	.60	Over	No	West	8 (44,47...
10	Chenango	399	3.6	28.3	27.3	5074	56	9.90	.42	Under	Yes	South...	7 (37-38)
11	Clinton	1194	6.3	34.2	18.2	5474	58	3.12	.40	Under	Yes	North	3 (29)
12	Cortland	734	5.1	38.3	34.4	5614	50	5.53	.34	Under	Yes	South...	6 (30,31)
13	Erie	4184	2.6	15.1	26.8	5987	62	122.27	.87	Over	No	West	9 (40,4...
14	Erie	1180	2.0	35.7	41.5	5868	65	417.45	.91	Over	No	West	9 (40,4...
15	Erie	1839	1.2	9.0	52.5	6082	60	57.97	1.22	Over	No	West	9 (40,4...
16	Erie	2293	3.5	19.9	40.1	5514	60	15.34	.59	Over	No	West	9 (40,4...
17	Erie	2626	3.3	22.6	33.5	5854	64	611.32	.65	Over	No	West	9 (40,4...
18	Erie	2505	1.1	8.8	53.2	6323	61	31.45	.79	Over	No	West	9 (40,4...
19	Essex	163	0	50.9	27.3	10900	54	1.18	.83	Over	Yes	East	2 (28)
20	Essex	164	0	18.9	50.0	8063	55	1.14	1.43	Over	Yes	North	3 (29)
21	Essex	271	0	38.4	47.4	6553	57	.80	1.81	Over	Yes	East	2 (28)
22	Franklin	1057	1.7	22.8	37.3	5414	64	3.54	.63	Over	Yes	North	3 (29)
23	Franklin	386	3.2	37.7	20.0	6548	63	1.79	.42	Under	Yes	North	3 (29)
24	Fulton	639	2.4	23.2	64.1	5513	61	4.37	.64	Over	Yes	East	1 (20-21)
25	Fulton	552	6.4	34.2	29.2	5164	61	6.32	.42	Under	Yes	South...	5 (33,34)
26	Hamilton	233	3.3	15.9	33.3	8514	53	.77	1.68	Over	Yes	East	2 (28)
27	Herkimer	736	4.0	34.2	29.7	6138	56	1.53	.69	Over	Yes	South...	5 (33,34)
28	Herkimer	1174	1.4	18.3	53.4	5013	64	26.74	.38	Under	No	South...	5 (33,34)
29	Jefferson	366	3.7	25.1	60.9	6491	61	5.82	.66	Over	Yes	North	4 (36)
30	Oneida	3703	3.4	8.9	45.3	5543	61	86.47	.75	Over	No	South...	5 (33,34)
31	Onondaga	1676	1.7	6.6	60.6	6133	60	21.95	1.05	Over	No	South...	6 (30,31)
32	Onondaga	868	1.7	16.2	37.3	5515	57	6.78	.60	Over	Yes	South...	6 (30,31)
33	Ostego	1291	1.2	13.4	45.3	4848	59	12.86	.82	Over	Yes	South...	5 (33,34)
34	Rensselaer	1051	1.5	8.1	37.7	5759	59	32.19	.74	Over	No	East	1 (20-21)
35	St Law	579	.7	33.2	35.3	5014	61	6.02	.34	Under	Yes	North	4 (36)
36	Steuben	742	2.0	23.6	52.9	5383	51	17.58	.33	Under	No	West	8 (44,47...
37	Steuben	1449	4.5	39.7	35.7	5665	58	8.85	.36	Under	Yes	West	8 (44,47...
38	Steuben	675	1.0	•	25.0	5637	57	4.87	.32	Under	Yes	West	8 (44,47...
39	Warren	451	2.2	37.5	20.0	7155	66	2.39	.69	Over	Yes	East	2 (28)
40	Warren	642	1.4	16.4	25.7	6861	51	4.21	1.01	Over	Yes	East	2 (28)
41	Washington	518	4.7	21.2	35.1	5562	61	8.60	.37	Under	Yes	East	2 (28)